APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,602	10/17/2003	Yasuo Ishiguro	82478-1500	2432

21611   7590   10/16/2007

SNELL & WILMER LLP (OC)
600 ANTON BOULEVARD
SUITE 1400
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

EXAMINER
DARNO, PATRICK A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/688,602	ISHIGURO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrick A. Darno	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _26 July 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-3, 17 and 20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-3, 17, and 20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _17 October 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 10102007

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 4-16 and 18-19 are cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-3,

17, and 20 are pending in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

Application Publication Number 2004/0236736 issued to Ronald M. Whitman et al. (hereinafter

"Whitman") and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,571,241 issued to Makifumi Nosohara

(hereinafter "Nosohara").

<u>**Claim 1:**</u>

Whitman discloses a data searching apparatus that searches a database of data files for a

desired data file *(Whitman: paragraph [0005], lines 8-10 and paragraph [0032] and Fig. 1)*, based on a

search condition set by a user *(Whitman: paragraph [0006], lines 1-10 and paragraph [0029] and paragraph*

[0032] and Fig. 1), the data searching apparatus comprising:

a receiving unit operable to receive, from the user, a search query that is a logical formula

including an AND search query and an OR search query *(Whitman: paragraph [0006], lines 1-2 and*

paragraph [0047], lines 6-10 and paragraph [0047], lines 16-22; Note the Whitman reference discloses a logical

AND operator. Furthermore, the Whitman reference suggests that other types of searches are possible. The

examiner believes it is clear that the reference discloses, or at the very suggest, the use of Boolean AND/OR queries.

Such queries are extremely well known in the art.);

a displaying unit operable to display the search query received by the receiving unit on

one region of a screen *(Whitman: Fig. 8 and paragraph [0088], lines 1-4; Note that the top region of the screen*

displays the users received search query "DOG".);

a searching unit operable to search the database for at least one data file that satisfies the

search query received by the receiving unit *(Whitman: paragraph [0006], lines 8-12 and paragraph [0041]*

and paragraph [0047]); and

an extracting unit operable to extract a plurality of frequently-used search keys for each

of the fields, from the data file that is a search result by the searching unit *(Whitman: Abstract and*

paragraph [0011] and paragraph [0026], lines 1-7 and paragraph [0039], lines 1-4),

the searching unit includes:

a search-key-list displaying unit operable to display a list of the frequently-used search

keys extracted for each of the plurality of fields by the extracting unit adjacent the search

condition set by the user *(Whitman: Fig. 8, 810 and paragraph [0051], lines 1-4 and paragraph [0088], lines 1-*

4; Note that the frequently-used search keys are displayed adjacent to the search condition set by the user.);

a key-selection receiving unit operable to receive, from the user, selection of at least one

search key from the list displayed by the search-key-list displaying unit *(Whitman: paragraph [0042],*

lines 7-13 and paragraph [0051], lines 11-14); and

a retry search instruction unit operable to add the selected search key selected in the key-

selection receiving unit, as an element of the OR search query for each of the fields, to the search

query, create a new search query, display the new search query on another region different from

the one region, and cause the searching unit to retry the search for a desired data file that satisfies

the new search query *(Whitman: Fig. 8 and paragraph [0051], lines 11-14 and paragraph [0088] and paragraph*

[0006], lines 1-2 and paragraph [0047], lines 6-10 and paragraph [0047], lines 16-22; Note that while portions of

the Whitman reference appear to be directed to joining together search keys with the 'AND' operator, paragraph

[0047] of the Whitman reference specifically suggests that other methods for processing queries can be used. And

the Examiner asserts that queries wherein search terms are joined using the 'OR' operator are extremely well known

in the art.).

Whitman clearly discloses querying html pages (or a form of text documents) *(Whitman:*

paragraph [0005], lines 8-10 and paragraph [0032] and Fig. 1). While Whitman does not mention

searching other types of document databases, Whitman does suggest that this search system can

be used with a variety of different computer systems *(Whitman: paragraph [0029])*. In light of this

fact, it is still important to note that the Whitman references does not explicitly discloses wherein

the document data files are patent documents; and wherein each patent document data file

including a plurality of search keys for providing clues to know contents of the patent document

data files, the search keys being categorized in a plurality of fields including an IPC symbol, an

F-term, and a keyword.

However, Nosohara discloses wherein the document data files are patent documents

(Nosohara: column 6, lines 60-63); and wherein each patent document data file including a plurality of

search keys for providing clues to know contents of the patent document data files, the search

keys being categorized in a plurality of fields including an IPC symbol, an F-term, and a

keyword *(Nosohara: column 3, lines 31-36)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teachings of Whitman with the teachings of Nosohara noted above for

the purpose of searching a database of patent documents *(Nosohara: column 6, lines 60-63)*. The

skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the teachings of Whitman per the above in

order to create a search engine which is able to retrieve documents in a variety of languages

(Nosohara: column 9, lines 2-5 and column 10, lines 1-16).

3.   Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitman in

view of Nosohara and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,249,784 issued to Thomas J.

Macke et al. (hereinafter "Macke").

Claim 2:

The combination of Whitman and Nosohara discloses all the elements of claim 1, as

noted above, and Whitman further discloses wherein the extracting unit includes:

a data-file-list displaying unit operable to display the list of document data files that are

search results by the searching unit *(Whitman: Fig. 8, 820)*; and

a file-selection receiving unit operable to receive, from the user, selection of a document

data file from the list displayed by the data-file-list displaying unit *(Whitman: Fig. 8, 820)*.

Whitman does not explicitly discloses wherein the document data files are patent

documents. However, Nosohara further discloses wherein the document data files are patent

documents *(Nosohara: column 6, lines 60-63)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teachings of Whitman with the teachings of Nosohara noted above for

the purpose of searching a database of patent documents *(Nosohara: column 6, lines 60-63).* The

skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the teachings of Whitman per the above in

order to create a search engine which is able to retrieve documents in a variety of languages

(Nosohara: column 9, lines 2-5 and column 10, lines 1-16).

The previously mentioned combination does not explicitly discloses a selective extracting

unit operable to extract search keys, from the patent document data file selected in the file-

selection receiving unit.

However, Macke discloses a selective extracting unit operable to extract search keys,

from the document data files selected in the file-selection receiving unit *(Macke: column 8, lines 20-*

21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Macke noted

above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned

combination per the above such that the user can interactively edit a search query based upon the

previously received search results *(Macke: column 8, lines 20-27).*

Claim 3:

The combination of Whitman, Nosohara, and Macke discloses all the elements, of claim

2, as noted above, and Macke further discloses:

the file-selection receiving unit receives, from the user, selection of a plurality of

document data files one after another from the list displayed by the data-file-list displaying unit

(Macke: column 8, lines 25-28), and then receives, from the user, one of (a) a key extraction

instruction to extract search keys from each of the selected document data files *(Macke: column 8,*

lines 20-28; The user must, in some way, trigger the extraction module.) and (b) an output instruction to

output each of the selected document data files *(Macke: column 18, lines 30-34; Shows the user selecting*

parameter that helps determine output. The actual command to search would be the user command to generate

output. The user must command the searching module of the invention to generate output.),

the selective extracting unit extracts search keys from each of the selected document data

files when the file-selection receiving unit receives the key extraction instruction *(Macke: column 8,*

lines 20-28),

the searching unit, every time when the file-selection receiving unit receives selection of

one or a predetermined number of document data files, reads the selected document data files

and stores therein the read document data files *(Macke: column 6, lines 57-63)*, and

the data searching apparatus further comprises:

a result outputting unit operable to output the document data files stored in the searching

unit when the file-selection receiving unit receives the output instruction *(Macke: column 4, lines 9-*

12).

Neither Whitman nor Macke discloses wherein the document data files are patent

documents. However, Nosohara further discloses wherein the document data files are patent

documents *(Nosohara: column 6, lines 60-63)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to further modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of

Nosohara noted above for the purpose of searching a database of patent documents *(Nosohara:*

column 6, lines 60-63). The skilled artisan would have been motivated to further improve the

previously mentioned combination per the above in order to create a search engine which is able

to retrieve documents in a variety of languages *(Nosohara: column 9, lines 2-5 and column 10, lines 1-16).*

4.   Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitman in view

of Nosohara and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0074671

issued to Tomokazu Murakami et al. (hereinafter "Murakami").

Claim 17:

The combination of Whitman and Nosohara discloses all the elements of claim 1, as

noted above, but the previously mentioned combination does not explicitly disclose wherein the

search key display unit displays the hit ratio.

However, Murakami discloses wherein the search key display unit displays the hit ratio

(Murakami: paragraph [0055], lines 31-35 and Fig. 9, 908; The display and use of a hit ratio or some other form of

document relevancy indicator is extremely well known in the art.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Murakami

noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the teachings of Macke

per the above such that the results could be returned, ordered, and displayed according to the hit

ratio *(Murakami: paragraph [0055], lines 31-35).*

5.   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitman in view

of Nosohara and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0187950

issued to Hawley K. Rising III (hereinafter "Rising").

Claim 20:

The combination of Whitman and Nosohara discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Whitman further discloses wherein the search key display unit simultaneously displays the search keys adjacent to the users displayed query *(Whitman: Fig. 8)*.

The previously mentioned combination does not explicitly disclose wherein the search keys are displayed in a plurality of categories to enable a user to paste the displayed search keys so as to modify the search condition of a further search.

However, Rising discloses wherein the search keys are displayed in a plurality of categories to enable a user to paste the displayed search keys so as to modify the search condition of a further search *(Rising: paragraph [0014], lines 29-35)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Rising noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination per the above such that the user can easily modify or alter an existing query based upon a library of stored queries *(Rising: paragraph [0014], lines 29-35)*. Such a query library would provide the user with the benefit of not having to memorize a query that is commonly, or frequently, used.

Response To Arguments

Applicant Argues:

Whitman does not teach or suggest retrying a previous search by modifying the previous search conditions by appending the search conditions with one or more search keys using logical OR operations. Furthermore, Whitman does not teach or suggest an extraction unit that extracts search keys based on the returned patent document data.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Whitman it is very clear that Whitman discloses retrying a previous search by modifying the previous search conditions by appending the search conditions with one or more search keys *(Whitman: Fig. 8 and paragraph [0051], lines 11-14 and paragraph [0088])*. In the embodiment chosen to describe the Whitman reference in paragraphs [0051] and [0088], the search conditions are appended with one or more search keys using logical AND operators *(Whitman: paragraph [0047], lines 6-9)*. However, Whitman explicitly suggests that other search methods may be chosen. Specifically, Whitman recites that "[a]lthough the search engine described herein logically ANDs the query terms together, it is recognized that the invention can be applied to search engines that use other methods for processing search queries" *(Whitman: paragraph [0047], lines 19-22)*.

The Examiner asserts that a well known method of processing queries involves using the logical OR operator to join query terms. This is more than just a mere allegation. In support of this viewpoint, the Examiner has provided the references cited below, each of which explicitly states that constructing queries using boolean operators (i.e., AND, OR, NOT) is well known in the art. The earliest reference cited by the Examiner has priority date of July 25, 1994. So the Examiner concludes that it using boolean operators such as AND, OR, and NOT has been well known in the art since at least July, 25, 1994.

Since each of the claim limitations is either disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are sustained.

- U.S. Patent Number 5,623,652 issued to Kumar A. Vora et al.

- Published April 22, 1997 / Filed July 25, 1994

- See column 9, lines 25-55.

- U.S. Patent Number 6,212,522 issued to Maria Azua Himmel et al.

    - Published April 3, 2001 / Filed May 15, 1998

    - See column 9, lines 11-18.

- U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0014396 issued to Navin Kabra

    et al.

    - Published January 16, 2003 / Filed July 16, 2001

    - See paragraph [0032].

- U.S. Patent Number 7,085,766 issued to Robert Olan Keith, Jr.

    - Published August 1, 2006 / Filed March 6, 2001

    - See column 3, line 64 - column 4, line 13.

Applicant Argues:

In fact, Whitman specifically teaches away from generating related terms and towards related phrases...Whitman does not teach or suggest retrying a previous search that is modified by appending the previous search conditions with one or more search keys using logical OR operations.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. First, the Examiner has proved above that the cited prior art either discloses or suggests retrying a previous search that is modified by appending the previous search conditions with one or more search keys using logical OR operations.

Second, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant that the Whitman

reference teaches away from generating related terms because the Whitman reference discloses

generating related phrases. As defined by the American Heritage College Dictionary, fourth

edition, a term is defined as a word or group of words having a particular meaning. And a

phrase is defined as a meaningful sequence of words. Surely a meaningful sequence of words is

equivalent to a group of words having a particular meaning. Since the definitions of term and

phrase are such that the two words appear to be synonyms, the Examiner is convinced that the

Whitman reference does not teach away from the claimed invention. In fact, it appears that the

cited prior art either discloses or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention.

Therefore, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are maintained.

Applicant Argues:

Whitman does not teach or suggest that the extraction unit extracts search keys from the data file that is a
search result by the searching unit.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. The Examiner is convinced that the Whitman reference

discloses wherein the extraction unit extracts search keys from the data file that is a search

result by the searching unit. Moreover, the Examiner has pointed out wherein the Whitman

reference discloses an extracting unit operable to extract a plurality of frequently-used search

keys for each of the fields, from the data file that is a search result by the searching unit as

claimed by the applicant (Whitman: Abstract and paragraph [0011] and paragraph [0026], lines 1-7 and

paragraph [0039], lines 1-4).

It is can be seen from the Whitman references cited above that Whitman discloses

extracting search keys from a file based on the frequency of use of the search keys. This portion

of the prior art is equivalent to the Applicants claim which recites an extracting unit operable to

extract a plurality of frequently-used search keys for each of the fields, from the data file that is

a search result by the searching unit.

Since it appears that each and every element of the Applicants claimed invention is

either disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are

sustained.

Applicant Argues:

The Office Action admits that Whitman does not disclose a search engine apparatus where the document data files are patent documents and where there are one or more search keys pertaining to a plurality of search field. The Office Action asserts that Nosohara teaches these features, but the Office Action does not explicitly provide any motivation to combine Whitman with Nosohara. The Supreme Court recently held that the analysis of combining prior art references should be made explicit.

> Often, it will be necessary...to look to interrelated teachings of
> multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design
> community or present in the marketplace; and the background
> knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the
> art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent
> reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed
> by the patent at issue. To facilitate review, this analysis
> should be made explicit. KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 127
> S. Ct. 1727, 1740-41 (2007).

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. After reading the Applicant's arguments, it appears that the

Applicant may have misinterpreted the Supreme Court's ruling with respect the KSR

International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR). In fact one of the key points established in the KSR

decision was that the suggestion or motivation to combine references **does not** have to be

explicit in the prior art.

In the Federal Register, Vol. 72, No. 195, Wednesday, October 10, 2007, the USPTO

published "Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in View

of Supreme Court Decision KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.". On page 57,534, column 2,

the Federal Register recites "[t]he courts have made clear that the teaching, suggestion, or

motivation test is flexible and an explicit suggestion to combine the prior art **is not necessary**

(emphasis added by Examiner)."

In response to Applicant's Arguments that there is no suggestion, teaching, or

motivation in the references to combine prior art, the Examiner respectfully points out that *KSR*

International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc. forecloses the argument that a specific teaching, suggestion, or

motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. Also see the recent Board decision

Ex parte Smith, --USPQ2d--, slip op. at 20, (Bd. Pat. App & Interf. June 25, 2007) (citing KSR, 82

USPQ2d at 1396).

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are upheld.

Applicant Argues:

A person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Whitman and Nosohara in the fashion claimed by the present application. As stated by the Office Action, a hypothetical combination of Whitman and Nosohara would create a search engine that is able to retrieve patent documents in a variety of languages.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. The motivation cited above is a reason why one of ordinary

skill in the art would choose to combine the Whitman and Nosohara references. The Examiner

agrees with the Applicant that this rationale or motivation to combine the teachings is different

from the rationale or motivation set forth by the Applicant. However, the Examiner reminds

the Applicant that it is permissible to use a rationale or motivation to combine the references

which is different from the Applicants.

The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor

has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the

prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by

applicant. >See, e.g., In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 987, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006); Cross

Med. Prods., Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc., 424 F.3d 1293, 1323, 76 USPQ2d 1662, 1685

(Fed. Cir. 2005) ("One of ordinary skill in the art need not see the identical problem addressed in

a prior art reference to be motivated to apply its teachings.");< In re Linter, 458 F.2d 1013,

173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972) (discussed below); In re Dillon, 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897 (Fed.

Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991) (discussed below). Although Ex parte Levengood, 28

USPQ2d 1300, 1302 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993) states that obviousness cannot be established

by combining references "without also providing evidence of the motivating force which would

impel one skilled in the art to do what the patent applicant has done" (emphasis added),

reading the quotation in context it is clear that while there must be motivation to make the

claimed invention, **there is no requirement** that the prior art provide the same reason as the applicant to make the claimed invention. (MPEP 2144)

Since the motivation to combine the references appears to be compatible with the requirements set forth by the MPEP, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are sustained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick A. Darno whose telephone number is (571) 272-0788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/688,602 Page 17
Art Unit: 2163

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Patrick A. Darno
Examiner
Art Unit 2163

PAD

WILSON LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER